श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह: सर, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि यह दोहरी नीति क्यों है?

श्री सभापति: ठीक है।

श्री कपिल सिब्बल: सर, कोई दोहरी नीति नहीं है शायद माननीय सदस्य ने आपको यह नहीं बताया कि इस संबंध में किस मंत्रालय को चिट्ठी लिखी। यह जो प्लेनेटेरियम बनाने का मामला है, यह साइंस एंड टेक्नोलॉजी मंत्रालय से संबंधित नहीं है। मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ कल्चर प्लेनेटेरियम बनाती है। मुझे यह मालूम नहीं कि माननीय सदस्य ने या सरकार ने कहाँ से और किसे चिट्ठी लिखी। इसलिए यह हमारे पास नहीं है। मैं इन्हें यह भी बताना चाहता हूं कि हमारे साइंस एंड टेक्नोलॉजी मंत्रालय में कोई दोहरी नीति नहीं है। अगर कोई भी मंत्रालय चाहेगा कि साइंस एंड टेक्नोलॉजी मंत्रालय की ओर से हम प्लेनेटेरियम बनाने में मदद करें, तो हम जरूर मदद करेंगे।

श्री सभापति: नेक्स्ट क्वेश्चन, 342.

Expansion of UN Security Council

*342. SHRI RAJ NATH SINGH: Will the Minister of EXTERNALAFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the latest position in relation to the expansion of the UN Security Council;

(b) whether Government have been assured of full support from the P-5;

(c) whether Government have been able to muster support in relation to this in the UN General Assembly; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI RAO INDERJIT SINGH): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) to (d) Government of India believes that no reform of the UN will be complete without the reform and expansion of the UN Security Council. The Security Council must, in its composition, reflect contemporary geo-political realities and not those of 1945; its actions must be representative, legitimate and effective and its methods of work and decision making process more democratic, transparent and responsive. To reflect the

changed realities, it is essential that the Security Council is expanded in both the permanent and non-permanent categories. The inclusion of developing categories. The inclusion of developing countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are capable of global responsibility, will contribute to optimal decision making necessary to address the insecurity of developing countries.

India's impeccable credentials for permanent membership of the UN Security Council are well known. It is clear and widely recognized that on the basis of any objective criteria such as the population, size, GDP, the economic potential, cultural diversity, civilizational legacy, maturity of political system, contribution to the activities of the UN, in particular to peace keeping operations, and its unique developing country perspective, India is well qualified to be a permanent member of the UN Security Council.

Support for India's candidature for permanent membership of the UN Security Council has been expressed in various forms and fora. Some countries, have expressed support confidentially in bilateral discussions. There has been a steady accretion of support to India's candidature since it was announced in 1994.

Any reform of the Un Security Council requires amendment of the UN Charter, which is complex exercise. India, along with Brazil, Japan and Germany-now being termed as the Group of Four (G-4) countries-have introduced a Framework Resolution which seeks to reform and restructure the UN Security Council through a three step process, consisting of a decision on the Framework Resolution, the election of new permanent members in the General Assembly and subsequently, the adoption of a Resolution for revision of the UN Charter. All these steps require support of two-thirds majority of the entire UN membership. For entry into force of the Charter amendment, ratification by two- thirds majority of the entire UN membership including all the current permanent members of the UN Security Council is required. The G-4 countries have been actively engaging with other member countries of the UN to mobilize support in favour of their initiative. They have formally introduced the Framework Resolution in the General Assembly. The African Union (AU) as well as the Uniting for Consensus Group, formerly known as the 'Coffee Club', have also introduced their Resolutions in the UN General Assembly.

India and other countries of the G-4 have been actively engaged with the countries of the African Union with the objective of introducing a joint G4-AU Resolution. On the basis of the understanding reached between the G-4 and the African Union Follow-up Mechanism during discussions held in London on July 25, 2005, it was agreed that the latter would consult the African States and revert on harmonizing the G-4 and AU Resolutions and having a joint Resolution. While the African Union, at its Extraordinary Summit held in Addis Ababa on August 4, 2005, could not endorse the London Understanding, further efforts in this direction are being made.

Among the P-5 countries (China, France, the Russian Federation, the UK and the USA), France, Russia and the UK have publicly expressed support for India's candidature for permanent membership of the UN Security Council. France is a co-sponsor of the G-4 Resolution and the UK is also supportive of this. The India-US Joint Statement issued on July 18, 2005 during Prime Minister's visit to Washington DC, *inter-alia*, states that "international institutions must fully reflect changes in the global scenario that have taken place since 1945. The president (of the USA) reiterated his view that international institution are going to have to adapt to reflect India's central and growing role." As for China, the Joint Statement signed by the Prime Ministers of India China on April 11, 2005, during the latter's visit to India, *inter-alia*, states "The Chinese side also reiterated that India is an important developing country and is having an increasingly important influence in the international arena. China attaches great importance to the status of India in international affairs. It understands and supports India's aspirations to play an active role in the UN and international affairs."

श्री राजनाथ सिंह: सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान उनके उत्तर के पैरा 5 की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। इसमें उन्होंने लिखा है कि on the basis of the understanding reached between the G-4 and the African Union Follow-up Mechanism during discussions held in London on July 25, 2005, it was agreed that the latter could consult the African States and revert on harmonizing the G-4 and AU Resolutions and having a joint Resolution. अब उसके बाद, while the African Union, at its Extraordinary Summit held in Addis Ababa on August 4, 2005, could not endorse the London understanding, further efforts in this direction are being made.

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या कहीं पर अपनी तरफ से कोई चूक हुई है अथवा प्रयास में कोई कमी रही है अथवा हमारी डिप्लोमेटिक स्किल में कहीं पर कोई कमी रही है,

जिस कारण हम अफ्रीकन यूनियन का सपोर्ट मस्टर नहीं कर पाए, हम अफ्रीकन यूनियन का सपोर्ट नहीं ले पाए।

SHRI RAO INDERJIT SINGH: Sir, it has always been known that getting into the Security Council is not going to be a cakewalk. And, despite our efforts,it is quite possible that nothing would happen. The impression that the African Union is not with India is a roaring news. The basic, fundamental, plank of our foreign policy is that we must build and strengthen our relations with the African Union. We must build South-to-South cooperation, and to ensure that Africa and India remain co-united, we have, as a policy, given grants under NEPAD, which is around $ 200 million; we have given grants under the Team-9 initiative, which is around $ 500 million. Thus, India and Africa have been working jointly and relations with India and the African continent have become better and not worse.

The question is that Africa has not been able to endorse the G-4 Resolution because of certain dissensions amongst the countries *vis-a-vis* themselves, North Africa versus South Africa, East Africa versus West Africa and so on. The hope we had the London understanding would be endorsed by the African Summit at Addis Ababa in Euthopia, could not somehow get through. So, unfortunately, at that time, we had to suffer a setback. But African relations *vis-a-vis* India have been on the mend always and Africa is supportive of India than members of the G-4.

श्री राजनाथ सिंह: सभापति महोदय, जहां तक अफ्रीकन यूनियन का सवाल था, उससे भी हम सपोर्ट नहीं ले पाए और साथ-ही-साथ Organisation of Islamic Conference के जो कन्ट्रीज हैं, उनमें से भी हम किसी का सपोर्ट सम्भवत: अभी तक नहीं ले पाए हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि आज से कुछ महीने पहले विदेश मंत्री जी का एक स्टेटमेंट हम लोगों ने समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ा था, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि भारत without right of the veto किसी भी सूरत में परमानेन्ट मैम्बरशिप को एकसेप्ट नहीं करेगा। उसके तुरन्त बाद अमेरिका ने रेस्पोंड किया। अमेरिका ने इसका खंडन करते हुए कहा कि The US Government will not accept any proposition that any new member of the Security Council will have the right to veto. तो किन परिस्थितियों में विदेश मंत्री जी ने इस प्रकार का स्टेटमेंट जारी किया था? जिस समय स्टेटमेंट जारी किया था, उस समय हम लोगों का भी यह विश्वास बढ़ा था कि निश्चित रूप से भारत की तरफ से ऐसी कोई पहल हो रही है। ...(व्यवधान)... सदन में भी कहा था कि भारत की तरफ से ऐसी कोई पहल हो रही है, जिससे जल्दी ही भारत को यूएन सिक्युरिटी काउन्सिल में वीटो पावर के साथ नहीं बल्कि विदाऊट वीटो पावर कम-से-कम परमानेन्ट मैम्बरशिप मिल जाएगी। सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि

जी-4 के जितने भी देशों के साथ बातचीत चल रही है अथवा जी-4 के जितने भी कन्ट्रीज़ हैं, उनमें आपस में भी जो आपकी बातचीत हुई है, तो क्या केवल परमानेन्ट मैम्बरशिप के लिए बात हुई है अथवा बात हो रही है अथवा परमानेन्ट मैम्बरशिप विद द राईट ऑफ वीटो बात हो रही है?

विदेश मंत्री (श्री के॰ नटवर सिंह): चेयरमैन साहब, राजनाथ जी ने जो सवाल पूछा है, वह वाजिब है। यह 1994 से चल रहा है कि सेक्युरिटी काउन्सिल को उदार होना चाहिए क्योंकि सन् 1945 में दुनिया की जो सूरत-ए-हाल थी, वह अब नहीं है। मगर सन् 1994 से लेकर 2004 तक कुछ नहीं हुआ था। 2004 में ब्राजील, जर्मनी, जापान और भारतवर्ष ने मिलकर यह आवाज़ उठाई कि सेक्युरिटी काउन्सिल को एक्सपैंड किया जाए और सेक्रेटरी जनरल ने भी एक हाई लेवेल पैनल बनाया था threats, challenges and change के लिए कि जब यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की 60वीं वर्षगांठ हो, जो 7 सितम्बर को है, उससे पहले कुछ सुझाव आ जाएं। जी-4 की सफलता यह हुई है कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की सेक्युरिटी काउन्सिल के रिफार्म्स का सवाल अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय एजेंडे पर रख दिया गया है और वह वहां से नहीं हटेगा। आपने वीटो का सवाल पूछा। मैंने यहां बयान दिया, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इसी हाऊस में यह बयान दिया कि नए परमानेन्ट मैम्बर और आरिजिनल 5 मैम्बरों में कोई भेद-भाव नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर यह उनके पास है तो जो नए बनें, उनके पास भी यह होना चाहिए। उसके बाद जब यह जी-4 बना और सेक्रेटरी जनरल यहां आए तो सेक्रेटरी जनरल साहब ने साफ-साफ कह दिया कि आप लोग अगर यह कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि जो वर्तमान पी-5 हैं, वे आपको वीटो दे देंगे, तो आप भूल जाइए। यह तो नान-स्टार्टर है। फिर हम चारों देशों की बातचीत हुई। हमारा जो फ्रेम वर्क है, उसमें जो को-स्पॉन्सर हैं, वे 32 हैं। फ्रांस ने भी को-स्पॉन्सर किया है। यह फैसला हुआ कि इस सवाल को, अगर यह यूनाइटेड नेशंस के रिफॉर्म्स को रोक रहा है, तो इसे 15 साल के लिए पोस्टपोन कर दिया जाए। हमारे जो सभी समर्थक हैं, ब्राजील, जापान, जर्मनी और इंडिया और हमारे को-स्पान्सर्स, वे मान गए कि इस सवाल को अलग कर दिया जाए। हमने यह नहीं कहा कि वीटो नहीं होना चाहिए, मगर यदि इसकी वजह से गाड़ी आगे नहीं बढ़ेगी तो हमने कहा कि चलिए, हम यह सैक्रिफाइस करते हैं। आप कोई भी क्राइटेरिया बनाइए, उसमें हिन्दुस्तान तो आता है। उन्होंने जो क्राइटेरिया बनाया है कि आपके साथ होना चाहिए। इकोनामिक पोटेंशियल। ...(**व्यवधान**)... तो इसकी वजह से फिर हमने हमारे अफ्रीकन दोस्तों से बातचीत की। पिछले सितम्बर की 24 तारीख को प्रधान मंत्री, ब्राजील के प्रेसिडेंट, जापान के प्राइम मिनिस्टर और जर्मनी के वाइस चांसलर और फॉरेन मिनिस्टर मिले और वहां ऐलान कर दिया कि हम चार उम्मीदवार हैं और यह भी कहा कि अफ्रीका को भी परमानेंट सीट होनी चाहिए। अब मुश्किल यह हो गई है कि अफ्रीका के साथ हमारी जो बातचीत लंदन में हुई, उसमें यह ब्रॉड एग्रीमेंट हुआ था कि एक ज्वाइंट रेजोल्युशन होगा। बात कहां अटकी थी? जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर जी गए थे ग्लेनिगल्स, तो वहां घाना के और नाइजीरिया के वरिष्ठ नेता, लीडर्स भी आए थे। ग्लेनिगल्स के बाद जब हमारी लंदन में मीटिंग हुई, तो

घाना के फॉरेन मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि आपने कहा है कि 25 मैम्बर होने चाहिएं, आज की तारीख में 15 हैं, 5 परमानेंट और 10 नोन-परमानेंट। हम चाहते हैं कि 25 हो जाएं और अफ्रीका चाहता है कि 26वीं सीट और कर दीजिए उसमें जी-फोर में भी कुछ मतभेद था, क्योंकि हम चाहते थे कि अफ्रीकन यूनियन को साथ लिया जाए। हमने कहा कि मंजूर करते हैं, आपकी 26वीं सीट हो जाए, मगर वह रिवोल्विंग सीट होगी, दो साल के लिए साऊथ अमरीका, दो साल के लिए अफ्रीका और दो साल के लिए एशिया। इस पर सहमति हो गई। फिर जो अदीस-अबाबा में जो सबमिट हुआ, तो उसमें मतभेद आ गए। अब यह है कि इस वक्त अलजीरिया इजिप्ट के खिलाफ है, इटली जर्मनी के खिलाफ है, चीन जापान के खिलाफ है, और हमारे ही पड़ौसी हमारे खिलाफ हैं। उन्होंने ग्रुप बना रखा है, कॉफी क्लब का। उसमें अर्जेन्टीना भी है, मैक्सिको भी है, कोरिया भी है, पाकिस्तान और इटली भी है। दूसरा अफ्रीकन यूनियन का, कुल मिलाकर तीन रेजोलूशन हैं अभी टेबल के ऊपर। हमने यह कहा है कि जब तक 128 नहीं होंगे, हम वोट नही मागेंगे। बगैर अफ्रीका के 128 किसी को नहीं मिल सकते और अफ्रीका के पास भी अगर पूरे 53 के 53 देश अगर मिल जाएं, तब भी नहीं होगा यह आंकड़ा पूरा। तो यह सवाल फिर उठेगा, जब जनरल असेम्बली की बैठक होगी। हमारी तरफ से कहीं कोई कमी नहीं हुई है, हमारी कोई डिप्लोमेसी फैल्योर नहीं हुआ है, बल्कि सफलता यह मिली है कि अमरीका की मुखालफत के बावजूद, चीन की मुखालफत के बावजूद जी-फोर ने इस सवाल को इंटरनेशनल टेबल पर रख दिया है, वहां से हटेगा नहीं। जब कभी भी एक्सपेंशन होगी, आसान नही है, पहले तो जनरल असेम्बली में आपको 2/3 मेजोरिटी चाहिए, फिर जिन देशों को आप कहेंगे, उनको 2/3 मेजोरिटी मिलनी चाहिए और फिर जाएगा रेटीफिकेशन के लिए देशों में, तो तीन कदम होंगे। उसमें समय लगेगा, मगर मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूं कि हमने कोई कमी नहीं रखी है, सब जगह स्पेशल एनवॉय भेजे हैं और हम चाहते हैं कि काम हो जाना चाहिए।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, the contemporary context of reforms in the UN is the fact that there is a single superpower who is undermining the UN system, and that is evident in what is happening even today in Iraq. Now in that context, the reform will depend on two-third majority of the UN system. Sir, through you, I would like to ask the hon. External Affairs Minister whether the perceived drift of the Indian foreign policy towards the United States in the past is creating problem for us to be favourably disposed with majority of the developing nations, whose support is the most crucial factor in taking forward this process.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: All I can say is that my understanding of our relationship with the United States is that our relations are very good; our relations with China are very good; our relations with Japan are very good; and, our relations with developing countries are very good. The fact is that

in the P-5, only three out of P-5 Members have agreed that there should be a reform. France has gone on saying that G-4 Resolution should be postponed. The reservations are from the United States and the People's Republic of China for different reasons. Now, the Chinese Prime Minister was here. I am not disclosing a secret. He told us that China would not be an obstacle for India becoming a permanent Member. I met the President of China, Mr. Hu Jintao in Kazakhstan six weeks ago and he also told me that China would not be an obstacle and we accept the word that they have given to us. The United States have announced that they will support the candidature only of Japan. So, we have asked them, does this mean that you accept the high level panel, Model 'A' which says that there should be an increase in Permanent Members. Their answer is 'no'. Japan is a special case. That is their position. And, they say, what is the great hurry in rushing on to this expansion of this Security Council before other reforms of the UN System like the question of the Human Rights Commission.

Now, Sir, the fact is that the Security Council is the most important element of the United Nations System, and, if the reform does not take place there, the other things will not follow. Now, we have told them, isn't 60 years enough for waiting because the world of 2004-05 is different from that of 1945. India is a founding Member of the UN. People don't seem to know. We were a Member of the League of Nations. The British had such a clout, at that time, that India was a prominent Member of the League of Nations. So we did not have to be elected.

The United States have made their position clear that, as of now, they are not in favour of the expansion to 25. They would like a Security Council of 20 or 21. The matter rests there. In September, we will all meet and we will extend the discussion with all countries. But this issue is not dying away.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, but I must observe that there is no reply. (*Interruptions*).

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी: स्वरूप किस तरह से तैयार किया जाए, उसके बारे में मंत्री जी ने कुछ नहीं बताया।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. (*Interruptions)*

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Chairman, Sir, first of all, I notice a sense of despair in the reply of the Government. The hon. Minister of State said just now, "Ultimately nothing may happen". I would also like to differ with hon. Minister of External Affairs when he says that between 1994-2004, nothing happened. When we announced our candidature in 1994, the then Congress Government, the subsequent UF Government, then our two Governments, we consistently worked during this period and built up a support base for India's candidature in the Security Council and the Minister admits as much in his reply, 'accretion of support'. Now, what has happened, Sir? What is happened is by getting together with this so-called, or, in the so-called G-4, we have now a situation where the US and China are actively working against our Resolution in the UN General Assembly. Even Russia, which has been a consistent friend of India and a consistent supporter, has publicly said that it is not in favour of the G-4 Resolution. African Union, Sir, is not prepared to support us. Then even our neighbours, like Sri Lanka and Nepal, I find, are not in support of the G-4 Resolution. Now, the Minister would like us to believe that by getting together in this framework of G-4, we have put the agenda of Security Council reform firmly on the table. I would like to join the issue with him and say that the reform of the UN system was put firmly by the UN Secretary General appointing the high level group and the high level group giving its report. That is the ...(*Interruptions*)... The Minister is giving a long reply. I have also to ask him a question. The point I am making is ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please put your question.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, the question I am asking the Minister is: was it a diplomatic error on the part of India to have left the company of the developing countries and worked together with countries like Japan and Germany and taken their liabilities rather than the assets? ...(*Interruptions*)... This is the question that I am asking ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister, please reply.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA:...because you don't know the difference between sinus and cyanide.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, I would like to assure my friend and former Minister of External Affairs that there is no question of any despair. Despair, for what?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Your colleague said it.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: No, no. He did not say despair. The fact is that it is extremely bountiful. If I were to enumerate to you the differences between the Africans, it will be a litany and will go on till evening, or the differences between developing countries, differences between the developed countries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please come to the question.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, it is an extremely complicated issue. And, the Secretary General's Report would not have taken off, if these four important countries, large countries, Germany, Japan, India and Brazil, they are not insignificant countries. We had pushed this. We would not like to put it under the carpet. We have made certain that this remains on the agenda and we will go on and try to do so. Sri Lanka is supporting us on the Resolution of our candidature, for your information. Afghanistan is supporting us. There are many countries which are not supporting. But, the African countries are supporting us. The South African countries are also supporting us. The G-4 has the maximum support at the moment, but it is not 128, and you know that as well as I do.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: What about that sinus and cyanide? ...(*Interruptions*)..

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sinus lead to despair and cyanide leads to suicide.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. The hon. External Affairs Minister has given a comprehensive reply. It is very clear that the UN Security Council, in its present form, is not representative in character. That is why, since 1994, India, along with other countries, has brought this issue to the fore for the expansion of the UN Security Council and staking its claim. Sir, given the developments which the hon. Minister has explained in his reply, especially the London meeting between the G-4 and the AU countries, followed by the reversal of the AU position, my specific question would be, given the regional divisions among the member countries of the UN whether in Africa, in Latin America and in Asia, over the candidature of one or the other, is India engaging its traditional friends in the Non-aligned Movement, especially in Africa, in Latin America and in Asia, to ensure that India's candidature has substantial support, especially when the final decision is taken up for the expansion?

Secondly, equally important, Sir, is, the Minister had replied about the Veto issue. Is Veto the contentious issue within the AU, because, in the AU Conference in Ethiopia, this issue was raised? And, if my understanding

is correct, the G-4 is trying to persuade the AU not to press for the Veto membership now on the Resolution. But, if the Veto is to be given up for the present, will it be suspended for 10 years or 15 years? And, will the P-5 accept the position, in principle, that the Veto to be given, but not to be made effective now?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, in the meeting that took place in Addis Ababa, the Africans demanded that if there is to be any reform or expansion in the Security Council, then, the African representatives, in the expanded Security Council, must have the Veto. On this, the Conference broke up. Now, what has happened is, the AU has appointed a group of 10 countries, two from each area, north, south, east, west and central Africa, at the state level, to discuss this issue and get back to the G-4 and other countries which have put in their Resolutions before the Security Council so that an agreement can be reached. The fact of the matter is that the position taken up by our African brothers in Addis Ababa, in our judgement, with great respect, is erroneous, because, as the Secretary General has said, "New permanent members, asking for a Veto, just forget it. It is a non-starter". We are in touch with all of them. We have sent special representatives all over the world. We have got re-assurance. Everybody agrees that there should be an expansion. It is all about how this has to be achieved. And, this achievement is what we are trying to get as many people, as many countries, as possible for agreeing to an expansion so that we can have 128 votes.

Indian Astronaut in US Space Shuttle

*343. SHRI S.P.M. SYED KHAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the USA is examining to include an Indian astronaut in their training programme who would board the US-manned space vehicle, Space Shuttle;

(b) if so, the details thereof and status of the proposal; and

(c) the details of the Indo-US initiatives on Space programmes in the recent years?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE (SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.